



Queen's University
Library

KINGSTON, ONTARIO

AN
A P O L O G Y
FOR THE
PULPITS:

Being in
A N S W E R

To a late Book, Intituled,

Good Advice to the Pulpits.

Together with an APPENDIX, containing a Defence
of Dr. *Tenison's* Sermon about Alms; in a Letter to
the Author of this Apology.

I M P R I M A T U R,

Liber cui Titulus, [*An Apology for the Pulpits, &c.
cum Appendice.*]

Jan. 12. 1687.

H. Maurice, Rmo. in Christo P. D.
Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. a Sacris.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *Dorman Newman*, at the *Kings-Arms* in the
Poultrey, MDCLXXXVIII.

1688.W54

1688.W54

AN
APOLOGY
FOR THE
PULPITS:
IN
ANSWER
TO THE
Good Advice to the PULPITS.

WE have been of late so much wonted to an Artifice which a sort of men amongst us have taken up, and so frequently warned of it, that none can now be well deceived, but those that are willing to be deceived: For by that time the Reader has but perused a Page or Two of their Writings, it will be hard if he doth not discover that the Title and the Design of the Book are two different things. After this manner proceeds the Author of the *Good Advice to the Pulpits*, who pretends to deliver a few Cautions, in which all Pulpits, whether of Con-

Epistle to the Reader.

formists, or Dissenters, of what sort soever, whether Protestant or Papist, are concerned ; as if he would deal his Advice with an impartial hand, and from each would have given such Instances of their Misrepresentations and Falsifications, Errors and Abuses, as might have been worthy of his Castigation. But whatsoever he pretends, this is apparently the farthest off from his intention ; for he no sooner enters upon his Task, but he lets drop two parts of his Distribution, and excepts the Papist and Protestant Dissenter out of the number of those he prepared his Cautions for, and both the Church of England and Dissenter out of the number of those he intends to vindicate from the Aspersions and Abuses of a Common Adversary. For thus he begins, *The matter is of Concern, and therefore 'twill not be improper to elucidate it by example ; and because the Aversion against those called Papists is most general, I'll let them be the Instance,* that is, of being blackned with infamous Crimes ; and if he had added, *because these called Papists have the greatest Aversion against the Clergy of the Church of England,* I'll on the other side let them be the instance of having dealt foully with them, it had been the just interpretation of his mind, but would have had in it more ingenuity and fair dealing than we may expect from one of his strain. So that in conclusion, the Cautions that he pretends to give to the Pulpits, are but as so many Invectives against the Pulpits of the Church of England ; and the whole design of his Advice from the beginning to the end of it, is to incense the Government of the Nation, and to instill into the minds of the people, prejudices against the Clergy of the Established Church. A Design mischievous enough but the way he has taken for it is as impertinent as one could wish. For who that considers the time that our Sovereign has Reigned,

Pag. 2.

Pag. 1.

Reigned, and can tell ten, but can easily understand how absurd and fallacious it is to charge the Pulpits with making their *Prince's Religion odious and contemptible to his Subjects, and thereby to undervalue the Prince to his People*; when the Sermons he quotes for it were preached, some of them 20 years since, and the rest in the years 78, 79, 80. How doth he inveigh against the Preachers? How Tragical are his Representations? What a bundle has he produced of Accusations? What dismal Inferences doth he make from them? First of all, *It does not look like the part of a good Subject, to undervalue his Prince to his own People.* Very well! *And yet he that inveighs against his Religion, seems to do so.* As how, and when! If you would know it, in the years 78, 79, 80. *Such and such Points of his Faith are painted out as Ridiculous, Nonsense, Prophane, &c.* And then he wisely infers, *Are not all these severe Reflections upon his [S. M's] Sense, his Judgment and Reason?* These are Fetches and *Innuendo's*, that are as peculiar and surprising, as the Inference is indecent and unmannerly. Surely these People think there is no Sense among Mankind, that put such hard things upon them; and others will think there is not much Respect to Majesty, that, when they want Reason for their own Vindication, they are presently lodging their Case at their Sovereign's feet; nay, thrusting themselves and all their Infirmities into his Bosom. Let them behave themselves like fair Disputants, and challenge the Sermons with Principles of Disloyalty to their Prince, or with Dishonesty in their Evidences, or Weakness in their Arguments. Do they find there the Doctrines of the Peoples Power over Princes, of the Lawfulness of Resisting, or of a foreign Jurisdiction over their Sovereign? Or rather, where have the Rights of Princes, and the Subjection and Obedience of the People in all lawful Cases,

st. to the
reader.

70.

Cases, and the Non-resistance in any case been so much asserted? A *Test* that deserves for some Reasons well known to the World, better to be wrote over the Pulpits both of Papist and Dissenter, than that which he would have a *standing Test* for the Preachers. And if this was the Doctrine taught in our Pulpits, whatever they were for Preachers (it's our Author's grievance, I perceive, they are so good) I am sure they were none of the worst Subjects. But after all, I have some reason to question what *Test* would sute our Author's Inclinations, who (besides what he disallows of preaching Non-resistance to the People, p. 69.) after all the Advice and Cautions he gives to the Pulpits, has taken no manner of care to lay down any one, about that kind of Loyalty which concerns all, of all Perswasions, and is taught in the Pulpits of the Church of *England*, which obliges them to be as Loyal when the Prince is of a different Religion, as when he is of the same with them.

But it's time to come to his Cautions, and to see how he quits himself in that undertaking.

First Caution.

THE Sum of this Caution is, That false Accusations against the Innocent get not up into the Pulpit. Suppose, saith he, that they [Papists] were accused by men of Infamous Lives, of the worst of Crimes, of designing against the Life of their Sovereign, against the Religion established by Law, against the Liberty and Property of their Fellow-subjects. To this he adjoyns his Instances, and fills up ten Pages with Quotations from several Sermons preached in the years 1678, 79, 80. for the most

*

part

part before the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, and by Persons of no less Character than *A. B. B.* and other dignified Persons in the Church. These he charges with *squaring the Gospel to the support and proof of Calumnies*, that by thus *holding forth*, are a *Scandal to their Profession*, that *incited Judges against the Defendants at the Bar*, *stirring up their Gall*, and *embittering their Spirits*, *filling the Judges and Lawgivers with Fury and Vengeance*, *fearing these would be too meek and merciful, unless some Clergy-cruelty were instill'd into them out of the Pulpits*. It is not worth the while to transcribe this sort of Flowers, which this Gentleman has, I perceive, a *Copia* of by him: had I a mind, I could easily recriminate, and remind him by whose instigation the *Marian* Flames were formerly kindled in this Nation, and by whom the *Complaint* was made in our neighbouring Nation that led the way to the severity therein practised. For the Case before us, our Author has so put it, as no peaceable man can delight to say much upon it, though it were in his own Vindication; and which he has so put, as if he did intend to revive these *fears and jealousies* which he pretends to warn us of. For if the *Mobile* are apt (as he saith) *to Take Fire at every Flash*, he must needs be sensible that they cannot read such *Quotations* as he produceth, without as well remembring at whose Order, and before whom they were Preached, as the quality of the persons that were the Preachers. If the charge was true, then by his own Confession, they *were the worst of Crimes*, and whatever the Preachers said was not to *stir up the Magistrates against Defendants*, but to do Justice upon Malefactors, and to secure their Auditors against such mischievous principles as they were supposed to act upon. But because this is not to be supposed; if the charge was false, and the Pulpits err'd in their Opinion about it; they

they err'd with those before whom they Preached, and from whom they received their Informations, and by whom they were ordered to Preach upon that occasion. They err'd with what our Author calls, *The greatest Tribunal of the Nation* in Parliament ; with *the highest and noblest Court in this, or perhaps any other part of the Christian World*, as the chief Arbitrator in it, deservedly calls it : Nay, with their Royal Master himself, who had so often in his Proclamations owned it to the World, and from which the Preachers both took the Information, and very often the Forms of words they chose to express themselves in. And after all the *Clergy-cruelty* he speaks of, these were the persons then charged with being cool in it, that were backward to believe it, that were Papists in Masquerade, because they would not run along with that Party that took into their hands the management of that matter. Surely our Author either was not aware of this, or presumed too much that others were not. If he was not, he has the more need to set it down in a *NB.* at the head of his Common-place Book, as a Caution to himself, that if for the future he shall have occasion to make use of such Quotations, he be careful to conceal the Auditory they were delivered before, as well as the Circumstances they were in ; lest he gives too much Authority to the Cause he would confute, and that the people who he saith, are *credulous at the noise of Plots and Designs*, should be inclined to believe them before himself. And if this should happen to be the event, let him assure himself, whatever allowance he may have from his immediate Superiors for such Publications ; he neither deserves, nor will have any thanks for it from those whose desire and study it is to be quiet.

P. 18.

Procl. Oct.
251. Nul. 17.
Exc. 1678.

P. 69.

Second Caution.

THE sum of that is, that if Preachers at any time lay open the Crimes of any People to their Auditory, they be careful not to urge their Accusations farther than they are certain, and know them to be true.

I hope our Author means not that sort of certainty which they call Infallibility; and that a Preacher must at no time, whatever the occasion be, produce any testimony but what is of that kind. For then what will become of those Miracles of the great *Xaverius* (as one calls him) which he did not onely equal, but exceed our Saviour and the Apostles in, when he is said to raise 25 Persons from death to life. What of the Attestation of Eye-witnesses, and even the very rigorous *Examen*? What of the Anniversary Sermons upon his Festival? Nay, what of the Canonization it self, which we are told is subject to Error? See Assert. 7.

Remarks of
A. P. upon
Dr. Tenison's
Narrat.
p. 12.

If he comes to a lower certainty, then let him consult not the Preachers, but the Authorities they went upon. As to the last of his Instances under this Caution, viz. *That Jesuits in disguise insinuate themselves among Dissenters*, I will recommend to him the *false Jew*, printed 1653. the *Quaker unmask'd*, and the *New Discovery*, printed 1656. or (because it may be easier procured) the Book call'd *Foxes and Firebrands*; which I must confess I know not what, but he may have more than I know of, to reply to.

Third Caution

IS, "That the Preacher would not be so passionately earnest in the discouraging the People from going over to another Communion, as to forget both Honesty, Justice, Truth and Charity. That they describe not the Doctrine of a Church from private Authors, from the extravagance of some Professors. That they give not out their own wrested Interpretations, horrid Misconstructions, as the Faith of the Church; especially that they give not too much Rope to their Inferring Faculty.

This is the sum of his Third Caution; and here he writes like a Cautious Person, and as one sensible that without prevention and a timely reserve, he may meet with some disadvantage, and lay himself open to his Adversary. The matters before were Political, he knew he was safe: but now he comes to points of Doctrine and matters of Fact in the Church, the old relief is call'd in: perhaps the Preachers did not talk without book, and that if call'd upon, they are able to produce their Authorities, and to justify what they say by their own Authors that have said it; and therefore he takes to a shelter betimes, that if the storm fall, he may be safe. It's either the *Doctrine of private Authors*, or some Persons *Extravagance* of their Church; or else it's the Preachers *wrested Interpretations*, or *horrid Misconstructions*, and a *giving too much Rope to their Inferring Faculty*. And to represent and demonstrate this, he has collected 27 Pages of Quotations from several Sermons; which are, he saith, *a severe Reflection upon their Reputation, upon their Charity, upon their Prudence, upon their Sincerity,*
with

with most Sober and Thinking Men. Sober and Thinking Men use not to pass Judgment without good reason, and it may be supposed will be ready to ask for what reason he should thus pass Judgment for them. To that he is provided to give an answer. Here are *Investives and Satyrs instead of Sermons*— *Heat and Passion, Choler and Gall*— *prophane Scurrility, unmannerly Jeers, spiteful Exaggerations, groundless Inferences, unworthy Charges, empty Sophistry, &c. and such Arguments as require a Fiend at the Elbow.* Whence is all this? Is that a Virtue in themselves which is a Vice in others? And may one man be wrathful and outrageous with Reputation, whilst another loses his Reputation by it? Or may he that would oblige the Pulpit to a Decorum, observe none with his Pen, and by assuming authority to correct a fault in another, may he challenge a liberty to commit it? Assuredly, if the other be *a character-making unworthy of those who profess a Reformation*, this is one that stands in need of it: And because he tells us, that to contrive it so as to *let the Teachers teach themselves*, is not *so obnoxious to censure*; let him learn better from his own Maxime; that 'tis *very ridiculous to see a man doing the very thing he condemns*. But what is it that has put this *Meek and Moderate, and Peaceable Man*, so much out of humour, that in the heat of his passion he should thus confound and contradict himself? Blame him not, for it is for *Religion* that he is so much concerned.

Be it so. May not, however, somewhat be indulged to their zeal against his Religion, as well as to his against theirs? But theirs is *a Pulpit-cheat, than which none is worse*.

There are *Calumnies, Falsities, False Inferences, Half-Descriptions, &c.* And then he throws out a Challenge.

P. 51.

P. 51.

Epist. to R.

P. 52.

P. 53.

“ If the Papists Religion be judged to be False and Erroneous, the way to shew it would be to produce their Avow'd and Receiv'd Doctrines, and prove them to be contrary to Scripture, and to the practice of the Primitive Church; this done without Passion and Indirect means, would not be unjust, nor so offensive: but why should false Things, and such Doctrines as they disavow, be laid to their charge?

Fairly moved! But it's one thing to prove a Doctrine to be False, another to prove it to be Theirs. The first is to be done by Scripture and Reason, and the Primitive Church, and doth not concern the present debate; and indeed has been already so effectually done, that it will cost more time to answer it, than to write *A Good Advice*. The latter depends upon Authority; and so whether they are their Doctrines, or whether they disavow them, must be considered from the approved Writers of their Church. And how far this also has been made good against all their late endeavours to palliate, disguise and conceal their Opinions, to the cost of the thing call'd *Misrepresentation* and *Exposition*, I leave to the World to judge, and themselves to disprove. A way that they would never have taken, nor have thus whined, complain'd and crouched, and have come to *Accommodations* and *Agreements*, if they could have bore up against their Adversaries by Scripture, Reason or Antiquity. But because this at present is a Track that they are in, and, for ought I perceive, cannot go far out of it, we are willing to follow them, and to hear their Complaints; which he has drawn up in 28 Particulars, extracted from the foregoing Sermons; and concludes, *'Tis certain the Papists disown these Doctrines, and preach against them as much as those very Doctors who appear so zealous to condemn them. If the Representer had but read* such

such Sermons as these, he needed not to have look'd further, to have made good his charge of Misrepresenting.

Had I now a mind to bring these Preachers off in the Adviser's way, I need but say they are the opinions of private Authors, the extravagances of some Professors, and the business would be at an end.

But as the Representer will never be dead so long as our Author is alive; so I shall try whether he is any whit more Infallible and Invincible than the other, by enquiring into those *Doctrines* which, he saith, the Preachers taught, and *positively charge* upon their Church, and their Church *disavows*; and whether he will abide by it that *the Papists preach against them as much as these very Doctors who condemn them.*

To begin then, he saith it's *positively asserted*,

That ~~the~~ different Orders amongst them [of the Church] Asser. 1. of Rome are so many Sects, and nothing but Fanaticks pack'd up in Convents. I have learn'd to wonder at nothing, or else I should, that our Author, who just before exclaims against horrid Misconstructions, should at his first setting out be himself so guilty of it, as to change the Terms of what he saith is *positively asserted*, that when the Preacher had said *there are Fanaticks in their Convents*, he makes him to say, *there is nothing but Fanaticks in them.* Let him turn to the words as he quotes them before, and either learn more sincerity, or give less Rope to his Inferring Faculty, before he again writes *Cautions against wrested Interpretations and Misconstructions.* P. 31. But I shall not thus leave the point. For I acknowledg that there are three things asserted by the Preacher.

1. That the different Orders of Religion among them are so many Sects of Religion.

2. That there are Fanaticks in their Convents.

3. That

3. That to pack up, or dispose of them there, is an advantage that their Church makes of it.

Now let us try what ground there is for them.

I. That *their Orders are so many Sects*, that is, so many distinct Bodies, that having different Founders, Rules, Habits, and often Opinions, by which an Emulation is begot betwixt Order and Order, they become divided among themselves; and when occasion is offer'd, do actually war one upon another in their way. It would be an endless task to travel through this Argument, and to give an Historical Relation of the Feuds that have been among them, and have sometimes for several Ages together molested their Church. Such was the Controversie about the size of their Hoods, and which, after an Age spent in the debate, was difficultly managed and ended by the Four Popes, during whose Reign it continued. Such again was that of the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary*, which was defended by the *Franciscans*, and opposed by the *Dominicans*, and which continued for 300 years together, having engaged Popes, Princes, Bishops, Universites, and whole Nations in it, such as *France, Spain, Italy, Germany*, and is not yet ended*.

* *Lucas Wadding*. Legatio de Concept. Sect. 3.

Tract. 12.

† *S. Amour* Journal.

|| V. Excommunication published by

Tho. Fleming, A. B. of *Doublin*, Answered, &c. An. 1633.

p. 19.

Such again were those Dissentions betwixt the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans* in the time of *Clement VIII.* and *Paul V* †.

Such are those between the *Franciscans* and the *Jesuits*, which have sometimes been so great and fierce, that each has proceeded to the Excommunication of the other ||.

So that it is no wonder we find men of Learning and Experience complaining of it frequently among themselves. Thus *Lucas Wadding* saith in his History above mentioned, that he dares not relate fully what happen'd upon the Contention about the *Immaculate Conception*, because of the Scandals of it.

2. There

2. *There are Fanatics in their Convents.* *Fanaticism* is a general name, and comprehends in it Superstition and Enthusiasm. The Former is the placing Religion in those things which Religion is not concerned in. The Latter is when persons are acted and governed by some supposed Communications from Heaven, by Revelations, Visions, Inspirations, by Raptures and Illuminations, and unaccountable Impulses. Of the former sort are their Orders themselves, their Habits and Rules, and the Priviledges granted to them, and depended upon; of which more hereafter: and which indeed very much arise from the latter. For to that [Enthusiasm] we owe the Orders and their Institution. So *Bellarmin* saith, That *the Orders of St. Benedict, St. Romoaldus, St. Bruno, St. Dominick, St. Francis, were at first instituted by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost.* And *St. Brigit* saith, the Rules of the several Orders in her time *were all received from him.*

De Pont Rom.
l. 3. c. 18.

Brigitt. Revelat. l. 7. c. 20.
p. 559.
Bellarm. de Purg. l. 1. c. 1 f.
De Sacram. Euch. l. 3. c. 8.
Wadding Legat. de concept. V. M. Sect. 3. n. 41.
p. 371.

To this they do not a little owe many of their Doctrines, such as Purgatory, and Transubstantiation, and the Immaculate Conception, &c. And many of the things defined and observed in their Church; as Sacraments, Festivals and Canonizations, &c.

And yet we have great reason to question these Revelations, &c. not only because it derogates from the authority of Divine Revelation, but also because they are far from agreeing in these matters among themselves. And of this I shall produce an instance beyond all exception.

It is the case above mentioned, about *the Immaculate Conception*, in which we have Revelation against Revelation, Saint against Saint, Order against Order, and Pope against Pope. For it are produced the Revelations of *St. Brigit*, which after a diligent enquiry by her Confessors, and by Bishops in her own Country, *Sweden*,

V. Wadding Legatio & Dr. Still. Fanat. of the Ch. of R. were p. 244, &c.

were approved of; and from thence transmitted at last to *Rome*; where by the appointment of two or three several Popes successively, the Testimonies were examined by Commissioners; and all confirmed by the Council of *Basil*; and the Canonized by *Boniface* the Ninth. And if this was not a *very rigorous examen*, I should distrust even that of *A. P's*, concerning his *great Xaverius*. And yet after all comes *St. Catharine of Siena*, with her Revelations to the contrary, who was Canonized by *Pius 2d.* and is said by him in his Bull to be *divinely inspired*, and her *Extasies* are declared to be *Holy* in the publick Offices of their Church, no less than those of *St. Brigit*. What shall we say in this Case? Nay, what is said by themselves? They e'ne say as they are for or against the *Immaculate Conception*: Those that are for it, charge the others with Forgery, as *Delrio* doth the *Do-*
minicans. Those that are against it, call the Revelations of the other, *Fantastic Visions*, and *Old Wives Dreams*, as do *Antoninus* (now a Canonized Saint) and *Cajetan*; let Popes and Breviaries say what they will. And those that are concerned in neither, will think hardly enough of both; and if they call it by the softer name of *Enthusiasm* and *Fanaticism* (in which their Cloysters do abound) they are more civil to both, than either of themselves is to the other.

3. However let it be as it will, the Church of *Rome* makes a singular *advantage* of it, and artificially prevents the mischief that might arise from it. For thereby not only countenance is given to many of her *Doctrines* and *Practices*; but also it being brought (as the Preacher saith) *under some kind of Rule and Government*, it's like Fire in a Chymical Furnace, that the Artift by his Registers applies and directs as he has use and occasion for it: And if at any time it happens to be rampant and

Breviar. Rom.
 Octobr. 8. &
 Apr. 30.

Disques. Mag.
 l. 4. c. 1. q. 3.
 Sect. 4.
 Ant. pt. 1. Tit.
 8. c. 2.

and outrageous, yet it being shut up in a Cloyster, as Fire in *Ætna*, it then spends it self for the most part (tho' sometimes it has happened otherwise, and which the most politick constitution cannot wholly prevent) without doing that mischief it would produce if at large and left entirely to it self. This is the grave account Mr. *Cressy* gives of this matter ; *If they have new and strange Revelations, they are not seditious and troublesome to the World* [except as before excepted] — *because these are enjoyed in solitude and retirement ; and supposing they be mistaken, no harm would accrew to others by it.* Sometimes indeed *harm* has *accrued* (as in the tumults about the Immaculate Conception) but more often *Advantage* ; or else they had never been so much cherished and indulged in the Church of *Rome*.

Preface to St
Sophia. Sect.
33.

The Sacrament with them is a Real, Propitiatory, but not a Representative Sacrifice. And Christ's Body is Really broken, and his Blood Actually spilt on their Altars. I perceive our Author has so much the faculty of what he decries, that he can scarcely repeat, and much less alter the Words of his Adversary, but he must alter the Sense : And so he doth here ; for he makes the Preacher to charge that upon the *Papists* as a *positive Assertion*, which is only a natural Inference from their *Assertion*. His words are (as the Adviser quotes them before) *In the Roman Church the Sacrament must Now be no longer a Representative, but a Real Propitiatory Sacrifice.* The word *Now* shews what the Preacher meant, That since the Church of *Rome* makes the Sacrifice of the Mass to be Real and Propitiatory, the Reason of the thing will teach that (whatever they say) it cannot be Representative ; it being no more possible that what is Real and Propitiatory can be Representative, than what is Representative can be Real and Propitiatory ; for otherwise the

Assert. 2.

thing that already is, is a Representation of it self. Thus it was with the Sacrifice which our Blessed Saviour offer'd upon the Cross, that was Real and Propitiatory, and not Representative; and if that in the Mass be the same (as they acknowledg) an Expression hedged in as a *Salvo*, will not make that to be true and reconcilable, which Scripture teaches to be false, and Reason teaches to be a contradiction in *Adjecto*.

He still goes on in the same way of *Misrepresenting*, and by leaving out the first part of the Sentence, maims the rest. For thus the Preacher proceeds, joyning what follows to what immediately went before——*And Christ's Natural Body must be brought down from Heaven upon a Thousand Altars at once, and there really broken, and offered up again to the Father, and his Blood Actually spilt a thousand times every day.*

It's apparent by the Connexion, and the *must be*, that the Preacher is arguing against them upon their own Principles, That if there be a Real and Propitiatory Sacrifice, and Christ's Body and Blood be substantially there, and that what was offered upon the Cross is Really and Actually offered upon the Altar, then there must be the Body Really broken, and the Blood Actually spilt. The Preacher knew well enough that the Church of *Rome*, which holds that there is whole Christ bodily under each Species, and under every particle of either, doth also hold, that what is broken is not the Body, nor what is spilt is not the Blood, but only the Accidents belonging to Bread and Wine, without their Substance. Now the Preacher could no more understand that there should be nothing there but the Body and Blood of Christ, and yet what was broken was not the Body, and what was spilt was not the Blood, than he could understand how the Accidents of Bread and Wine could be there without the

the substance of Bread and Wine ; or the Accidents could be broken, where the substance was not present. Something is really broken and spilt, if it be a Real and Propitiatory Sacrifice ; something is really broken and actually spilt, as our senses tell us, and as they acknowledg : And that the Body and Blood should only be there, and yet that not be the body that is broken, nor that be the blood that is spilt, is next to the affirming that its broken and not broken, spilt and not spilt ; grant the Preacher the Reason, and much good may it do them with their Assertion. Now, Where is *the passion*, or where *the indirect means* used by the Preacher ? It's indeed plain Reasoning ; and if Reasoning be what our Adviser has so great a spight at under the Names of the *Inferring Faculty*, and *Drawing Consequences*, it may be consistent enough with an Implicit Faith, but not with that the Apostle would have us be able to give a Reason of.

In Transubstantiation they renounce all their five Senses. Assert. 3. Here our Adviser trips again ; For is there no difference betwixt, *Men must renounce all their five senses*, as the Preacher said ; and *the Papists do renounce all their five senses*, as our Monitor saith ? The former is to shew that men can upon no less Reason embrace Transubstantiation, than the renouncing their Senses : The latter is to say, that they that hold Transubstantiation, do professedly and actually renounce their Senses. The truth of the former depends upon the truth of the Reasoning, and its an Argument drawn *ab absurdo* ; That if sense be a proper judge of sensible objects, and if what my sense tells me is there, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation will not allow to be there, then I cannot be for Transubstantiation, but I must quit the judgment of Sense, and my Sense must so far be no Sense. And what can be Reasoning, if this be not ? or how can I have a better

Catechif. ad
Paroch.

gument against any Principle, than that I must renounce those Principles by which alone I am capable of making a true judgment upon it? As for the latter, tho' the Preacher doth not charge it upon them that *they* actually and professedly *renounce their Senses* in Transubstantiation; yet they come not far short of it, if they hearken to their Church, which requires their Preachers to teach the people that they carefully abstract from sense in this matter, which in plain English is to lay it aside.

A Short Cate-
chism by way
of Q and A.
1686.

But all this while, for ought I know, I may be in an Error, and that our Author's Reflection is upon the Phrase, *All their Five*; for I have learn'd of late that there is one of the Senses for Transubstantiation: And that tho' what we *See*, and *Tast*, and *Feel*, and *Smell*, is Bread and Wine; yet *Hearing* tells us otherwise, which is *the Sense Faith challenges*; and you must *bear the Church*; and the Church tells us it's the fleshly Body of Christ. If this be our Author's meaning, I have done with him, till he can shew me a Church that has such an Organical Tongue to speak, as I have an Ear to hear.

Affert. 4.

That the Pope in his Chair cannot err if he would; and all others without his Assistance cannot but err. This is the first Matter of Doctrine that our Adviser hath produced from his Authorities; and so indeed the Preacher expressly calls the first part of it, *The Doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility*.

One would have thought that when our Author is so warm upon this Argument, and vehemently expostulates after this manner; *Why should False things, and such Doctrines as they disavow be laid to their charge? Why should it be so positively asserted in the Pulpits, That — The Pope in his Chair cannot Err?* One would have thought, I say, that this is a pure Invention of the Preacher, a spice of his *Inferring Faculty*; and that
its

it's certain the Papists disown this Doctrine, and Preach against it, as much as those very Doctors who appear so zealous to condemn it. To say the Truth of it, I find this charged upon the Church of Rome in so many Protestant Books, that if it be not traced to Rome, and found at the *Limina Apostolorum*, nay, in the Chair it self, I will cry out with him of *Falsities* and *Calumnies*. But I am every day more and more hardned against *Implicit Faith*; for I plainly perceive that Representing and Misrepresenting are by use made so much alike, that if things improve this way they are at present in, we shall not know whether White be White, and Black Black: And therefore I am for the old way, and shall try whether what our Author disavows in his Churches Name, the Church it self and other Authors (as much to be credited) in that Church, do indeed disavow: I shall begin with Cardinal *Hosius*, who saith, *God requires not that a Man should consider whether the Pope be a Judas, or a Peter, or Paul, but only this, That he sits in Peter's Chair—from whose mouth he is commanded to seek the Law. This thing only would Christ have him to observe.*

In Confess.
Petricov. c. 29.

And again; *Be the wickedness of Popes never so great, it cannot hinder but the Promise of God shall ever be true, The Popes shall ever shew thee the truth of Judgment.*

Id l. 2.
Contr. Brent.

Let us proceed to Cardinal Bellarmine, He saith, *That the Pope, whether he be an Heretick or not, cannot by any means define what is heretical, to be believed by the whole Church.* And he adds, *That this is the most common opinion of almost all Catholics, and is the most certain opinion, and to be maintained.* And this he further labours to prove from Scripture, and produces the Testimonies of several Popes. *Suarez* delivers this almost in the words of our Preacher; and as he begins with, *This is the Catholick Truth*; so he concludes, *Thus all the Catholick Doctors*

De Rom.
Pontif. l. 4.
c. 2. Sect.
Quarta Sententia.

Cap. 3.

De triplici
virtute. Theol.
Sect. 8. Disp. 5.
teach de reg p. 212

teach in these days. It were endless to heap up Authorities of this kind, and therefore before the Adviser comes again to find out Misrepresentations in the Sermons of the Church of *England*, and to caution its Preachers, let him first teach his own, and clear the Fountain-head, even *Rome* it self, and give the Chair due correction, from whence all this Misrepresenting Doctrine is derived; and hath diffused it self so as to become Catholick, if the foresaid Author is to be credited.

As for the other branch of the Preacher's Saying, that *all others, without his assistance, cannot but err*, its joyn'd to *be alone cannot err*, and so are opposite parts: The first is granted by those that say the Pope is Infallible, That is, is so Infallible, that he *alone* is out of a possibility of erring; and consequently all besides him are Fallible, that is, are liable to err, and can neither be secured against it, nor know but that they actually do err without his assistance and direction. Therefore, saith *Bellarmino*, *The Church doth always want some one by whom it may be confirmed, whose Faith cannot fail.* If the Preacher went beyond this, what Author or Authors he had for it, I know not; they do not at present occur to me. The first Branch is the point, and that I question not but I have sufficiently vindicated him in.

They prophesie in an Unknown Tongue. By which the Adviser would doubtless have the Reader think the Preacher so absurd, as to say that they of the Church of *Rome* do preach in an Unknown Tongue to the People. I commend his ingenuity here however, that he has retained the Preacher's own Term: but I should have commended it more if he had set the whole Sentence again before the Reader's Eye, which is, *She professedly edifies the People in Ignorance by praying and prophesying in an Unknown Tongue.* I deny not but the Apostle in *1 Cor. 14.* calls expounding the

De R. Pontif.
l. 4. c. 3. Sect.
Alter.

Affert. 5.

Articles of Christian Faith, and of the Scriptures that contain it, by the name of *Propheſie*; and that the two branches of his Diſcourſe, and in which he ſhews the unprofitableneſs and abſurdity of uſing an Unknown Tongue, are Propheſie and Prayer. But yet it doth not appear to me that the Preacher here underſtood it of vulgar preaching, becauſe he knew it to be otherwiſe: and if he had ſo meant, he would rather have choſe the Term more known, than that which is leſs; and ſince he uſed propheſying and not preaching, its apparent he did not mean preaching by propheſying. But what then did he mean by it? What could he mean but that which he is ſpeaking about, The publick Service of that Church? (of which preaching is no part) which conſiſts of Prayers, and Leſſons, (either taken out of the Scriptures or Legends) and Hymns? And whereas the one as well as the other ſhould according to the Apoſtle's reaſoning be in a Known Tongue, for Edification; in the Church of *Rome* the one as well as the other is in a Tongue Unknown to the People; and ſo that end is defeated. And when he can prove that the Scriptures are not to be read in the Church, or the Hymns not to be uſed in a Known Tongue, or that theſe are not parts of the Service diſtinct from their Prayers, or can ſhew us that they are read among them in a Tongue known to the People, it will be time to give him a farther answer. But more of this anon.

They make no other uſe of Confeſſion than what profeſs'd Affert. 6:
Drunkards do of vomiting.

This Affertion of the Preacher concerns not the Doctrine, but the Practice of the Church; nor the Practice of the Church ſo much as many of thoſe that are of it. It's matter of Fact and Obſervation, and ſo is to be judged of either by the Confeſſion of the Church it ſelf, or
by

*Alvar. Pelarg.
de plant. Eccl.
l. 2. art. 78.
p 255.*

by Observation. That it is so, is past contradiction ; So faith one of themselves, speaking of those that come to Confession, *What they say one day, that they say the next ; as if every day they sinned alike.* But though it be so, yet the Church is not chargeable with it, unless there be such Doctrines and Penances in the Church as do give not only occasion, but encouragement to it. The Former I shall make good, *Affert. 21.* And the Latter is notoriously evident, not only from common Experience, but from the Book called *Taxa Camerae Apostolicae* ; in which the Absolutions are set at a price for Crimes of all sorts ; and of which Book *Espencæus* (a Learned Bishop of theirs) faith, that *it's so far from being suppress'd, that the Licenses and Impunities are for the most part continued.*

*Comment. ad
Tit. c. 1. Di-
gress. 1.*

Affert. 7.

Their Saints are Canonized for Treasons. detestable Villanies, as a reward of strife and every evil work. As our Author has ordered the matter, it looks as if the Preacher had asserted that *Treason, &c.* was the constant, or at least the most prevalent reason for Canonization in the Church of *Rome* ; whereas the words are plainly otherwise : For thus the Adviser himself had before set them down ; *It's much less [lawful to pray] to those that Have been Canonized for Money or for Treason, &c.* All he faith is, that such *Have been* Canonized for these reasons ; which being matter of Fact, and a charge of Male-administration, we must enquire whether any such Persons, and upon such motives, have been Canonized in the Church of *Rome.* And in order to this I shall shew, that according to the Principles of that Church it may so happen ; and then I shall consider what in Fact has been done.

Upon their Principles it may so happen. For it's granted

1. In general, That the Pope, however Infallible in matters of Faith, is Fallible, and may Err in matters of Fact, and in things depending upon humane Testimony; and that though he takes the Advice of his Councillors, and be in a General Council. This *Bellarmino* saith *all* *De Pontif.*
Catholicks agree in. *Rom. l. 4. c. 2.*
SS. His notatis.

2. From hence it follows, that Canonization being matter of Fact, and depending upon Testimony, the Pope himself may Err in it. And of this mind are several eminent Men in that Church; *Canus* for one, who saith, that *the Church in it leans upon the Testimony of men, which may deceive, and be deceived.* *Loc. l. 5. c. 5.*
It's an Examen, in *qu. 5. concl. 3.*
Mr. P's phrase; and let the Examen be very rigorous, even as great as that in the Case of Xaverius, it's an Examen still. The Canonizer may therefore be mistaken, and may Canonize a Rebel for a Saint.

Farther, This has been done. In how fair a way it was for it, let the History of *Maria Visitationis*, Abbess of the Annuntiation at *Lisbon*, be an instance; who by having 32 Wounds upon her head made (as she pretended) by our Saviour's putting his Crown of Thorns upon it, and by her great Reputation for Holiness, imposed first of all upon her Confessor, the Learned *Ludovicus Granatensis*; then upon the Inquisition, who examined and approved these Marks; then upon Pope *Gregory XIII.* who encouraged her to go on in the way she had begun; and I need not add, upon whole Nations. If she had died in these Celebrated Circumstances, she that was so like to, nay, that exceeded *St. Francis* in these Sacred Stigmata, had been doubtless enroll'd in the Number of Saints; and had had all the 7 Honours due to such (which *Bellarmino* hath recited) conferr'd upon her. *De Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 7. SS. Sed antequam,*

Lud. a Para-
mo de Orig.
Inquis, l. 2.
Tit. 2. c. 15.
n. 11, &c.

But this was prevented, for the whole was discovered to be Imposure, and a cunning contrivance to set on foot the Revolt of *Portugal* from *Spain*; and which I question not but King *Philip* gave the name of Treason to.

But this is but a probability, and therefore let us proceed, and come nearer home; and there we have an instance in the famous *Thomas a Becket*, A. B. of *Canterbury*; of whose Rebellion against his Prince our Chronicles treat at large; and of whose Canonization the *Roman Offices* are a sufficient Evidence. And now whether this Adherence of his to the Pope against his Leige Prince was not Treason, or whether it was not an Inducement for his Canonization, let the Law speak for the one, and the Office for his day for the other, where they pray *that God by his Blood would save us, and bring us to Heaven.*

Breviar. Sa-
risb. Fest.
S. Tho. Cant.

Affert. 8.

They pray to a Crucifix as well as to Christ himself; and attribute as much satisfaction to it as to the Blood of their Redeemer. The Preacher appeals for this to their Offices, and thither we must go. For this that is here spoken of, being a charge of Words and Forms, we must know whether the Charge be true or false, by considering those Forms. And if words will make it plain, the Preacher was not mistaken. For thus the Bishop prays at the Consecration of a Crucifix, *that God would bless the Wood of the Cross, that it may be a saving Remedy to Mankind, a steadfastness of Faith, an increase of good Works, the Redemption of Souls, &c.* When the Cross is thus Consecrated, and has upon Consecration this Divine Capacity bestow'd upon it, wherein doth it in its vertue differ in words from Christ himself? And why may it not then be pray'd to? And whether it be not so, let the Hymn *Vexilla Regis*, shew, and that part in it so often used, *O Crux ave spes unica, &c. Hail O Cross, our Only Hope,*

Pontif. in Be-
ned. Nov. Cru-
cis.

Hope, increase grace in the good, and blot out the sins of the guilty. For the exposition and vindication of which, let me commend our Author for Advice, to his Friend the Representer and Misrepresenter; and with them Consultation I shall also leave this Head.

Confession tends to the debauching both Laity and Clergy. Assert. 9. The words of the Preacher (as our Author quotes them before) are, that *particular Confession of Sins* to the Priest *instead of keeping up a wholesome Discipline, is the way to corrupt it—when the Confessor and Penitent begin to discover and understand one another.* The Preacher grants Confession to be a *wholesome Discipline*, but as it's maintained and practised in the Church of *Rome*, where the secrets of a man's breast must be deposited in that of the Priest, it cannot but often expose the Confessor and Confessed to dangerous snares. And that he was not herein mistaken, we have many instances. What the case was in the Church of *Constantinople*, that all persons were set loose from that obligation of private Confession, by *Nestarius*, Predecessor in that See to *S. Chrysostom*, I leave to our Authors consideration.

Socrates, l. 5. c. 19.
Sozom. l. 7. c. 16.

This I am sure of, many wise and good men in the Church of *Rome* have complained of gross miscarriages in their own Church, from whom let our Adviser learn it rather than from me; and to them I refer him.

Biel in Can. Lect. 77.
Alv. Pelarg. Arc. 27. p. 11.
Ec.

And if this was not, or what was very rarely to be observed, why are such shameful Cases relating to this matter put by their Casuists, *Utrum Confessor, &c?* or why was there Bull after Bull from the Pope's *contra solicitantes in Confessione*? He that will satisfy himself in this, let him read *Job. Escobar a Corro* upon the Bulls of *Pius IV.* to the Bishop of *Sevil*, and of *Gregory XIII.*

Opusc. Cajet. Tract. 22.
Bull of Pius the IVth to the Bishop of Sevil. A. D. 1561. and of Gregory the XVth. 1622.

That every thing is meritorious with them that is for the Church's Interest. The words of the Preacher, are (it

Assert. 10.

seems) as follows. *The Churches Interest is the Center of their Religion, and their Consciences turn upon the same pin. Every thing is pious, conscientious, and meritorious, that makes for their Cause.* Now if the former part be true, that *the Churches Interest is the Center of their Religion*, then the latter is not to be wonder'd at, that *every thing is meritorious with them that makes for that Interest.* The Former part the Preacher undertakes to prove.

1. From the *Supernumerary Articles of the Council of Trent.*

2. He proves it from their *Politick Creed*, the Articles of which the Preacher tells us are such as these. That *the King is the Pope's or the Peoples Creature*, and may be *deposed* by either of them for *Tyranny or Heresie*, &c. How much He is the Peoples Creature, let *Bel-larmine* tell him. And how much he is the Pope's, let him learn from seven of their own General Councils; and whether this be not to serve their Interest, let him learn from *Lessius*, who makes the Doctrine of Deposition as necessary to maintain the *Authority of the Church*, as to be received for an *Article of Faith.*

How far the Preacher enlarged upon the latter part, that *it's meritorious with them*, &c. I know not, (having seen no more of the Sermon than the Adviser is pleased to give us) but I find that once upon a time, those that fought against a prevailing sort of Heretick were esteem'd to merit Heaven by it. If our Author desire it, I shall direct him for it to good Authority. But for the present I shall only ask his sense of a certain Passage I have met with; It is this. "It seems to us, that no Consti-
"tutions, Declarations, or any Order of Living can
"bring upon [any] an obligation to Mortal or Venial
"Sin, unless the Superiour should command those
"things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in
"the

*Discussio De-
creti Mag.
Concil. Later.
p. 89.*

*Constit. So-
ciet. Jesu,
par. 6. c. 5.*

“ the vertue of Obedience, which may be done in
 “ those things, and by those persons in which it shall be
 “ judg’d, that it shall much conduce to the particular
 “ good of any one, or to the Universal good. If I un-
 derstand this at all, the *good it may conduce to*, whether
 particular or universal, will make venial or mortal Sin to
 be none; or which is the same, will make it lawful to
 be done, when *commanded by the Superior*. But of this
 again, Assertion the 12th.

They change Scripture into Legends, the Sacraments in After. 12.
to Shows, Preach Purgatory instead of Repentance, and
Faction instead of Faith. This is put by way of Suppo-
 sition in the Sermon, but yet I acknowledg it’s level’d
 against the Church of *Rome*, and by which the Preacher
 intended to set forth some of the gross corruptions of it.
 The Points are Four.

1. *They change Scripture into Legends*; That is, either
 accounting Legends of as good Authority as Scripture,
 or by using Legends in their Service instead of Scripture.
 There is too much occasion given for the first; and the
 second is too evident to be denied. By Scripture we
 mean that Book which both contains in it matters of
 Divine Revelation, and was writ by persons Divinely in-
 spired. And since Divine Revelation gives it its Autho-
 rity, whatever has that Authority given to it, is made
 equal with Scripture: For Divine Authority is always
 alike. But now there are Legends or Narratives of the
 Saints Lives, Miracles and Revelations that are owned
 by the Church of *Rome* to be of Divine Revelation;
 And why not then are they of as good Authority as the
 Scripture? I could cloy the Reader with Instances of this
 kind; But let that of *St. Brigit* serve, whose Revelations
 they own in their publick Offices, to have *come immedi-
 ately from God to her*. In which also they often use Le-
 gends instead of Scripture, and have put out Scripture

Breviar. Rom.
 8. Octob.

for

for Legends, as the discouragement of Cardinal *Guignoni*'s design shews, whose Reformation of the Breviary, and his insertions of Scripture into instead of their Legends, would not be admitted. And yet what the Legends generally are, let us take from an Impartial hand, that of their Learned *Espencæus*, who saith *they are as full of vanity, as Stables of Dung.*

In 2 Tom Digress. l. i. c. i. i.

2. *They turn Sacraments into Shows.* And is not this done, when the people are shew'd the Cup, but not suffer'd to partake of it? When the Priest alone doth often Communicate? When the Host is elevated at the Mass for Adoration, and carried about the Streets in publick Procession? Which are ends the Sacrament was never intended for, nor have we a Syllable about it in Scripture.

3. *They Preach Purgatory instead of Repentance.* The thing supposed here is, that the Doctrine of Purgatory doth invalidate that of Repentance, and gives encouragement to defer and neglect it.

And that it doth,

1. As it takes people off from the consideration of one of the most powerful Arguments to Repentance, and that is the Fear of Hell, or Eternal Torment. For if there be a middle state for those that are meanly good, then those that conceive themselves not to be grossly wicked, comfort themselves with the hopes of this.

2. It makes them more studious of what will make them safe, than what will make them happy; and if they stop at Purgatory, they are not concerned for any thing farther.

3. It makes them put off their Repentance, so far at least as what they call Satisfaction is concerned; because they shall have a further allowance of time for it in another state.

4. And so much the rather, as they may there be relieved or delivered from thence by the Masses, Prayers and Alms of the Living.

Now

Now if Purgatory be Preached, we may understand how much the Doctrine of Repentance loses of its weight, authority and obligation thereby. And if they do Preach Purgatory instead of Repentance, and press one more than the other, there is a reason for it which I care not to name; no more than I shall endeavour to charge the matter of Fact upon them at present.

4. *Instead of Faith they Preach up Faction.* The Preacher supposeth this has been done, and done with acceptance. And so far as the Doctrines of the Pope's Jurisdiction over Princes, and his power to depose them has been Preached, I should not scruple to call it Faction, and by a harder name; tho' what our Author will call it, I know not; but he leaves us to suspect what he would not call it by his omission of the next Clause to it:

To be false and deceitful, is to become worthy of Heaven. Affert. 12.

The Preacher after the former Clause thus proceeds: *Tho' instead of Obedience we became guilty of Treason; Nay, should we Murther Princes, and prove false and deceitful to mankind, all would be well, and we in an instant thought worthy of a better Kingdom.* He must not blame us here, if we put him in mind of two of our Nation, and of an Order named by the Preacher, that we find in the Catalogue of their Martyrs, tho' they justly suffer'd for Treason; and which is somewhat greater, of the solemn Oration made at Rome after the Assassination of *Henry 3d*, and the Character given therein to the wretch that imbrued his hands in that Prince's Blood.

Bibliotheca
Jesuit.

Thuanus
Tcm. 4. l. 95.
An. 1589.

Sometimes with Money they compound for their unfor- Affert. 13.
saken Sins. Of this, see the Appendix.

If the Pope and his Emissaries say the Right hand is Affert. 14.
the Left, the Papists are bound to believe it. The Preacher refers to a Gloss of theirs for it, which our Author has fairly left out, and there I might leave it:

it. But I am willing to enquire further into it. This, how strange soever it may seem to *thinking men* (in our Author's Phrase) yet is very well consistent with their Religion, which takes them off from thinking; and with those Principles that lead to it. As to begin with what the Preacher introduces this with, faith he,

1. They hold that the Pope is, *Alter Deus in Terra; another God upon the Earth*; and if he will have it in other terms, *Dominus Deus noster Papa, Our Lord God the Pope*; The places are well known in their Glories on the Canon Law, that speak thus respectfully of him. Grant the Pope but the thing that these Titles belong to, and he may well be allowed the Authority of being believed if he should so determine that *the Right hand is the Left*.

2. I may add, That this is no more than what is included in the Doctrine of *Implicit Faith*; by which persons are obliged to believe the Church, as well when they have no Reason, as when they have; in which they are not only *safe*, but do what is *meritorious*. That they are *Safe*, faith (a) Cardinal *Hofius*; That it's *Meritorious*, faith (b) Cardinel *Tolet*.

3. If I am not mistaken, Virtue is the *Right hand* in Morality, and Vice is the *Left*; and yet Bellarmine faith, *If the Pope should err in commanding Vices, or forbidding Virtues, the Church would be bound to believe Vices to be good, and Virtues to be evil, unless she would sin against Conscience*. And I think the Rule of Ignatius given to his Society, imports no less, That if the *Catholick Church* defines that to be *Black*, which appears to them to be *White*, they are notwithstanding to account it to be *Black*.

4. Its brought still lower; For those of Ignatius's Order are to renounce not only their own wills, but their understandings also, without calling any thing into question; for

(a) Contr.

Brent. l. 3. p.

146.

(b) De Instruct

Sacred l. 4. c. 3.

Señt. 7.

De Rom. Pont.

l. 4. c. 5. SS. ult.

Ignatius Exerc.

Spirit. Reg. 13.

Cl. Aqua vivæ

Industria c. 5.

n. 6.

for otherwise the excellent virtue of Blind Obedience would fail——and that they must be as a Carkass, which suffers it self to be carried any way. And which is yet nearer to the purpose (because those are but particular Rules) Cardinal Tolet saith, *If a Country-man, concerning Articles of Faith, do believe his Bishop proposing some Heretical point, he merits by believing, although it be an Error; because he is bound to believe, till it appears to him to be against the Church.* Bellarmine somewhere brings it down to the Parish Priest or Confessor; but because at the present I can't remember the place, I shall omit it; but if our Author has a mind to be instructed from us Protestants in their own Authors, I question not but to gratify him with it, and with many others of the like kind.

No Man can be a Papist, but he whose Eyes are blinded by Education, or he who puts out his Eyes by Atheism. Affert. 15. The Preacher infers this from the former, *No Man therefore can be a Papist, &c.* Whether the latter Proposition be reasonably infer'd from the Premises, I leave to our Author's Faculty to judge: But this I may say without offence, that he that knows not his Right hand from his Left, or needs to be taught which is his *Right*, and which is his *Left*; or will believe him that tells him what he knows to be his *Right*, is yet the *Left*; or thinks himself bound to believe him that so tells him, whatever place his Teacher holds in the Church, how high soever his prerogative of Teaching be; He that is in this condition, and that is of this mind, had need have something to be beholding to; and if Education be not that, I know not what is: For to believe against Sense and Reason, is one of the hardest things in the World. And it's to be fear'd the Church that obliges its Members so to do, had need to keep men much in the dark, and to tye them up very hard,

hard, or else that they will be of no Religion, whilst they are for that Religion, which allows them not to know what they know.

Assert. 16.

They pray unto Images for the Pardon of their Sins. The Images in the Church of Rome, are the Representers of those to whose memory, and for whose Honour and Adoration they are Consecrated and set up: And so what Honour is due to the Represented, is exhibited to the Representer; and he that prostrates himself before them, and there Addresses and leaves his Prayers, is supposed to prostrate himself before, and address his Prayers to, and leave them with the Holy persons thereby Represented; who are the more pleased and the better accept them for this Honour done to themselves by their Images. And therefore he that thus worships, and thus prays, thus worships and thus prays to the Image, as to the person he would thus worship, and thus pray to, if he was visibly present; and how nicely soever men may speak in disputation, yet if we will take it from St. *Augustin*, he saith, *That none can pray or adore, beholding an Image, who is not so affected, and doth not think that he is heard by it.* Now whether this is not likely to be so, I shall detain the Reader with a short Story, seriously told by *Cornelius Curtius*. *There is an Image of Christ at Lucca (of which he gives the Sculpture) which had Silver Shoes, before which a poor man prostrated himself, and prayed Christ to help him in his great necessity. At his Prayers the Image, Aut potius Christus in Imagine, or rather Christ in the Image, bowed himself, and offered his Right Shoe to the Beggar, which he took; but it was redeemed by the Church, tho' it could never be put upon the foot again.* Now what could the poor Man think, and what doth *Curtius* think, but that Christ was there present in the Image? and to what Image would the Suppliant then repair, or where could

Epist. 49.

De Clavis Dominicis, c. 5.
p. 61.

could he think to be so well heard for the future as there? And why should he not pray to that Image, which thus effectually answered his Prayers, and shew'd by its Actions that he might commendably pray to it? And if they may, and do pray to Images, why not for pardon of Sins? For of whom they are heard, by them they may obtain pardon; according to the quality of the Persons thereby represented: And if they may say to the Cross, *thou our only Hope*, they may pray again, *blot out the Sins of the Guilty*. Of this see Assertion 8.

This is one of the *Absolute Falsities*, and *Wicked Calumnies*, the Adviser charges upon the Pulpits; There it's preached, *they pray to Images for the pardon of their Sins*. And without doubt he hoped the Reader would take it for such upon his credit without further examination. Whether, if it had been preached, it was a *Falsity*, let what has been said be consider'd. But what if this was not said by the Preacher? Where then will lie the *Falsity* and *Calumny*? For that let the Adviser answer if it be proved upon him, and let me answer if I do not prove it. What saith the Adviser, It was deliver'd in the Pulpit, that *they* [of the Church of Rome] *pray unto them* (Images) *not only for temporal or ordinary Blessings, but* Good Advice, p. 42. *for spiritual and supernatural, such as the pardon of their Sins*. I at first wonder'd why our Author placed here a full stop, and did not go along with the Preacher, who adds to *the pardon of their Sins—and the Holy Spirit, and Eternal Life*. For if the Preacher spoke this of Images, the further he had gone, the more would it have served the Adviser's purpose, to have shew'd the Absurdity of the Preacher, and the *Abuse* he puts upon them; as thus, *they pray to Images for the pardon of Sins, and the Holy Spirit, and Eternal Life*.

But he had another design in his eye, he thought this would look a little too gross, the Reader might perhaps be tempted to see with his own Eyes. How, charge them with *praying to Images, for the Holy Spirit, and Eternal Life*, when we are told of late they pray not at all to them! And if the Reader had so done, he would have discovered the Art (I would be willing to call it the mistake) of the Adviser that applies that to Images, which the Preacher speaks of Saints and Angels.

Let the Sermon speak for it self. At Page 13. the Preacher thus enters upon a new Paragraph. *What say you to the Doctrine of Image-worship? with which I will join that other of praying to Saints and Angels.* He then begins with the first of these, and shews what the Council of *Trent* decreed concerning Images, what is to be understood by the Veneration decreed therein to be given to them, and what is the practice of their Church. Of this part he discourses for near a Page together. Having finished this, he proceeds to the second Branch, *viz.* Invocation of Saints and Angels, in these words.

And they do all the external Honour to the Saints and Angels in the Addresses they make unto them, whether immediately, or as Represented by Images, that 'tis imaginable they should do to our Saviour himself, or the Blessed Trinity.

Nay, they pray unto them not only for Temporal or Ordinary Blessings, but for Spiritual and Supernatural, such as the pardon of their Sins, and the Holy Spirit, and Eternal Life. So that till our Author can make Images and Saints to be the same, he must be contented with his own words, that it's an *Absolute Falsification*. And it did concern him therefore with a gentle score -- to bring one Passage from the beginning of the first Branch to the last of the second Branch, and to place them together, the better

better to cover the *Abuse* he puts upon the Preacher and Reader together.

The Passion of Christ takes away only the Guilt of Mortal Sins, not their Eternal Punishment. Assert. 17.

This Assertion implies these things.

1. That the Guilt of Sin may be taken away, when the Punishment is not

2. That the Guilt is taken away by one cause, *viz.* the Passion of Christ, and the Eternal Punishment by another.

3. That the Passion of Christ only takes away the Guilt of Mortal Sins, but doth not take away the Eternal Punishment.

1. The first of these is granted, being one of the main Principles the Doctrine of Purgatory depends upon. So the Council of *Trent*, *Sess. 6. c. 14. Sess. 14. c. 12.*

2. They grant that the Guilt is pardoned for one reason, and the Punishment taken away for another.

So *Bellarmino* saith of the first, *All Divines teach that Satisfaction is not offered to God, nor exacted from men for the Fault, for God doth discharge us from the Fault by his Grace.* And yet he hath a whole Chapter to prove that *men may satisfy for the expiating that Punishment which sometimes remains after the remission of the Fault.* De pœnit. l. 4. c. 1. SS. Jam igitur cum. So that he saith the Grace of God, and elsewhere the Passion of Christ, takes away the Fault; and the Satisfaction a man makes, takes away the Punishment *truly and properly*, cap. 3. Ibid. c. 7. SS. Nos igitur. as he elsewhere saith.

3. From hence it follows, that if the Grace of God takes only away the fault, and that We properly satisfy for the punishment, that so far as the punishment is taken away by our satisfactions, so far it is not taken away by the Merit of Christ. And therefore how far soever the Grace of God, and Merit of Christ may be otherwise

De Purgat.
l. 1. c. 14. SS.
Tertius ta-
men. Edit.
1605.

concerned, yet there is, as to the punishment, a peculiarity ascribed to Human Satisfactions. Thus *Bellarmino*, *It doth seem the most probable, that there is but one actual Satisfaction, and that is ours.*

4. This is granted of Temporal Punishment, that it's not taken necessarily away with the Guilt, but that the Punishment may remain after the Guilt is pardoned: but the Question will rest upon the Eternal Punishment.

De Poenit. l. 4.
c. 1. SS. Quod
si probatur.

For the understanding of which, it's to be remembred, that they teach that the punishment due to Sin is not properly removed with the Guilt, but that in kind it remains after the remission of it. This *Bellarmino* agrees to in the words of *Cajetan*; *Cardinal Cajetan rightly explains this, viz. That Punishment which remains to be paid after the Remission of the Fault, is the very same Punishment of sense which the Sinner ought to have suffered in Hell, the Eternity only being removed.* So that the Punishment remains in nature the same, but is by some means changed from Eternal into Temporal. The solution of which, when, and how, and by what means this change is made, will lead us into a right understanding of this matter.

De Purg. l. 1.
c. 14. SS. Por-
ro applicatio.

Bellarmino indeed saith, that *the Eternal Punishment is changed into temporal, when the Guilt is forgiven.* But let this Assertion be as it will; if the Eternal Punishment is in some cases changed into Temporal by the same means by which the Temporal is removed; then the Merit and Passion of Christ is in those cases no otherwise concerned in taking away the Eternal Punishment, than it is in taking away the Temporal. But it is granted, that in taking away the Temporal, the Passion of Christ is only mediately, and remotely, and improperly concerned, and that it's taken away immediately, and properly, and actually, by other means, such as Satisfactions, &c. and it

it is *de Facto* so in exchanging the Eternal into Temporal; which is done by Satisfaction, the Power of the Keys, and Indulgences. So *Vasquez* concludes as to the Former, that God's Grace supposed, as to Mortal Sins, *we do indeed satisfy God for our sin.* And as to the two latter, the first about the Power of the Keys, shall be undertaken, *Affert.* 21. The second, how Eternal Punishment is changed into Temporal by Indulgences, I shall remit to the Appendix.

P. 3. D. 2.
c. 6. n. 98.

From all which it appears, what ground there is for this Assertion of the Preacher, that *the Passion of Christ takes away only the Guilt of Mortal Sins, not their Eternal Punishment*; that is, that there are those ways of taking away the *Eternal Punishment* in the Church of *Rome*, and of changing it into Temporal, which do no more concern the Passion of Christ in it, than in taking away the Temporal; that is properly, immediately, and actually taken away by Humane Satisfaction, &c.

The bare saying of Prayers, without minding what they say, is acceptable to God. *Affert.* 13. The words of the Preacher are here but partially related, For thus they are produced. *What say you to the Doctrine of opus operatum, which makes the meer work done in all Acts of Devotion sufficient to Divine Acceptance: particularly the bare saying of Prayers, without either minding what they say, or understanding it.* So that what the Adviser quotes is a particular of the foregoing General; and brought by the Preacher as an instance of what he had charged upon them. He tells his Auditors, *that meer work done in Acts of Devotion, is, in the opinion of the Church of Rome, sufficient to Divine Acceptance.* To this our Author hath nothing, it seems, to say, and indeed it's so agreeable to the Council of *Trent*, that he that will deny it, is in danger of its *Anathema.* But supposing any one should be so hardy as to deny

Sep. 7. Can. 6.
8. 12.

deny it; the Preacher fortifies it with an Instance, *Meer Acts of Devotion are, faith he, sufficient*; for so is the bare saying of Prayers, without either minding what they say, or understanding it. And yet lest this should want of its force, he goes on: *And agreeably hereunto the Romish Church enjoins the saying of them in a Language unknown to the generality of her Children.* If I am not mistaken, our Author has here involved himself in no small difficulty, and must either grant that which he would fasten as a *Falsification* upon the Preacher; or (which is worse) must condemn his own Church for enjoying the Worship of God to be so administered, as to be unacceptable to him. It's apparent that the Publick Prayers in their Church are in a Language unknown to the Generality of the People; it's as Evident, that they cannot mind what they do not know nor understand; and he acknowledges here, that without minding what they say, their Prayers are not acceptable to God. So that consequently Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, are not acceptable to God. I know our Author is no friend to Inferences; and it's likely he will put the case upon another issue, that the Preacher charged this as a Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that *the bare saying of Prayers, without minding what they say, is acceptable to God.*

And it's likely there he will stick, unless he conceals himself under the words, *minding what they say*: I was upon this running to Cardinal Tolet, to Salmeron, &c. to give our Author satisfaction in the point; but I considered that was a great way to go, and a good substantial English Author might do as well: and to him I recommend ours; and that is the Representer, who saith: *It's an undeniable thing, that, to say Prayers well and devoutly, 'tis not necessary to have attention on the words, or on the sense of the Prayers.* And having brought these two

Friends

Friends together, I leave them to compound the matter between them; and shall pass on.

They appear before God in their Churches Dumb and Senseless, like an Idol. After. 19. The Adviser had done the Preacher more right, if he had kept to his words, *So are the*

People to appear before God, &c. For the *So* would have intimated the Connexion they have to somewhat foregoing; and the words, *the People*, would have shew'd that

the Clergy were not herein included (though many of them are involved in the same case, if their own Authors are to be credited.) Sixt. Senens. Biblioth. l. 6. Annot. 263. To return, the Preacher saith, *The*

Pope takes from them the knowledge of the Prayers offer'd in their name, and lets them not understand their own desires. So are the People to appear before God dumb and senseless like one of their Idols. Now here it's suppos'd that all

publick Prayers are offer'd up to God in the name of the People; that the People ought to know what is put up in their name, and to join in it, that by their consent they may be Their prayers and desires: and that if they

do not understand, nor give their Amen and Consent (which they cannot do unless they understand) that then they are *dumb* and *senseless*; by which means their Prayers

are defeated of their Acceptance, and they of their Right. Now I would fain understand, what is the part of the People, and wherein they are concerned; if not in what

is done for them, and in their behalf; or for what end even their Service is so compos'd; as to have in it Petitions, Exhortations to attention, Responses, Lessons, Creeds, &c. which in the first design of them were contrived and ordered for the People, and in the nature of

them do imply it; and yet the People too be as *dumb* to speak, and as *senseless* to understand as an Idol? The matter of Fact, that so it is, is evident against our Adviser's Remark; but the Reason of it I am yet to understand.

Assert. 20.

They avowedly allow what God positively forbids. The words of the Preacher, as afore-recited, are, *They absolve in some cases from the obedience of God himself, and avowedly allow, what he as positively forbids; authorize Incestuous Conjunctions, and license Perjury.* The Charge has two Branches, viz. the absolving from what God commands, and the allowing what he forbids; but though these are opposite Terms, yet as the Authority of God is equally concerned in both, so it's equally invaded in the violation of either. And whether the Church of *Rome* forbids what God commands, or allows what he forbids, She is (if guilty) equally an Offender. And that remains to be tried, in which I shall follow our Author, and confine my self to his branch, *they allow what God forbids.*

It is a saying of Cardinal *Zabarel*, that in the Church of *Rome*, *they have persuaded the Popes that they might do all things whatsoever they pleased, although unlawful; and that, sint, plusquam Deus, more than God.*

But this however true, may seem to be too extravagant; and it's more than I am obliged to prove. But let us see what power is challenged, and then we shall find

De Concess.
præbend. &
propofuit, &c.

1. The Canonists agreeing that there is no Divine Law but what the Pope may dispence with, except the Articles of Faith.

Cont. Cajet. 6.
p. 524.

2. Wherein any of the Divines do differ from the Canonists, it is not in the power, but the way of explaining it, saith *Catharinus*, whether it be properly or improperly: that is, saith *Suarez*, it's no formal Dispensation of the Divine Law but the matter of the Law is changed.

De vot. 1. 6.
c. 9. n. 7. &c.

3. The same Author saith, It's manifest the Church hath granted real Dispensations in this kind; and the Gloss upon the Canon-Law gives us some Instances, in which the Pope doth dispence against the Law of God, as *Vows* and *Oaths*.

Of the Former *Escobar* faith, that by virtue of a Bull the Vow of not sinning may be changed, as in Fornication. Theol. Mor.
To. I. l. 7.
c. 20. n. 231

Of the Latter, *viz.* Dispensing with Oaths, the Instances are so notorious and many, and so often produced, that it need not to be insisted upon. After all it must be confess'd, that the Preacher fail'd in the modish way of expressing himself; for he should have said, the Church hath a Power of *altering* the Nature of things, and that what was before an *Incestuous Conjunction*, is by the Dispensation made lawful and honest, and not incestuous; and then it's likely our Adviser might have had nothing to say. It's no matter whether we cannot find out the difference, when they do.

To Confess, and to be Absolved, is sufficient for the Forgiveness of Sins, though there be no Sorrow for the Sins at all, but only for the Penance. It is so, faith the Preacher, in effect; when, *It is not necessary to this Absolution, that they should be contrite or heartily sorry; for Attrition with Auricular Confession, shall pass instead of Contrition.* I am here at a stand, to know whether our Author objects against the Doctrine the Preacher charges upon the Church of *Rome*; or against what he faith, it is in effect. Methinks there is little Reason for the Latter; for if Forgiveness of Sins be the consequence of a just Absolution, and if that be a just Absolution which is the consequent of Confession and Attrition, then certainly *to Confess, and to be Absolved, is sufficient for the Forgiveness of Sins, though there be no sorrow for the Sins at all, but only for the Penance*, that is, though there be only Attrition; for what is Attrition, but a sorrow for the penance and the punishment threatned to Sin, though there be no true sorrow for the Sin? So that the Point will rest upon the Former, *Whether Attrition with Confession doth pass* Assert. 21.

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 14. c. 4.

Seff. 7. de Sa-
cram. Can. 6.
Seff. 14. cap 4.

instead of Contrition? This I confess the Council of *Trent* is cautious in, because it's a Doctrine so manifestly repugnant to the Scripture, and gives so great a liberty to sin, that it's highly scandalous; but yet it takes care to secure the Reputation of their Church in a matter of greater consequence to them, and that is, Infallibility, and that it doth by covertly maintaining this Doctrine which had been long a prevailing Doctrine in their Church. For first, we are there told, that *the Sacraments do confer grace upon all, and always upon such as rightly receive them*. And again, that *Attrition doth dispose the Sinner to receive the grace of God in the Sacrament of Penance—and doth bring to Justification*. Now if Attrition doth dispose the Sinner for Justification, and for the Grace of God in that Sacrament, and the Sacraments do confer Grace on those that are disposed; then the Grace of God is received, and the Sinner justified upon Attrition, though without Contrition.

Cat. ad Pa-
roch. par. 2.
c. 5. SS. 38.

This is more fully express'd in the Catechism, which saith, *Though the Sinner be not affected with such a grief for his sin, as may be sufficient for pardon; yet when he has rightly confess'd to a Priest, all his Sins are pardoned, and by the power of the Keys in Absolution an entrance is opened into Heaven*. If there was need for it, I could multiply Authorities from the Casuists (who certainly are proper Testificators to it) but I shall appeal for it to the privilege obtained (as it's said) by the Blessed Virgin for her devoted Clients, which is, that *none of them can depart this life without Sacramental Confession*, and all Grace belonging to it: of which I shall give a remarkable Instance. “A certain Bandito having understood from a poor Woman, and she from a Holy Man *in the Pulpit*, that whoever fasted upon the Saturday, in Devotion to the Blessed Virgin, should be sure to Confess in the point

“ point of Death, nor should depart without true Penance, and should avoid Damnation. He vowed to observe this as long as he lived, which he did; but after many years it happened this Robber was surprised in his Wickedness. and without delay had his Head struck off Which was no sooner done, but the Head thus severed from the Body, cried out *Confession, Confession, Confession.* The Standers by amazed, sent for a Priest to the next Village, who laying the Head to the Body, The Thief told them that he had this grace shewed him, because he had done this good in his life, that he fasted on the Saturday; and that when the Devils would have taken away his Soul, the Blessed Virgin appeared, and would not permit the Soul to go out of the Body, till he was fully contrite, and had confess'd all his Sins. Which having done, he died.

I have indeed the Story immediately from *Spinellus*, (and who will may find more there of the same kind) but he from *Pelhartus*, and *Anselm*, and the Book called *Scala Cæli*: and *Spinellus's* Book is licensed by the General of the Jesuits, *Cl. Aqua Viva*, &c. There was a time it seems when this Doctrine was taught in the Pulpits, and it's still good Doctrine with others; and whether we must take this Doctrine of the Church from those, or the Adviser, needs no great deliberation.

An Indulgence or Pope's Pardon purchas'd with Money, serves with them instead of Sanctification, and a Godly Life. Assert. 22.

The Indulgences are (as the Preacher saith well enough) the merits of others stored up in the Churches Treasury, and distributed according as the chief Steward of it sees fit, and upon what terms he pleases to those that have them not of their own. The Preacher saith it is by way of Commutation instead of Holiness, and a Godly Life, for those who give Money for them. The First of these he wanted

Pet. Spinelli
Amor Dei pa-
ræ Virginis.
Colon. 1649.
cap. 1. n. 24.

V. Pope Clement. VI. in
Constit. in
Bellarm. de Indul-
g. l. 1. c. 2.
SS. ult.

Gul. Tyrius
Histor. Orient.

Chron. p. 322.

De Invent.
l. 8. c. 1.

not Authority for; for by those were Persons of the most profligate Lives encouraged to go for the Holy Land, and on other Expeditions, when they had thereby indulged, and had a promise of an Eternal Reward; though guilty of those Sins that excluded out of the Kingdom of Heaven, as the Historians tell us: and which were so absolute and plenary upon other occasions in future Ages, that it encouraged the Dissolute, and became offensive to the Virtuous. So *Conradus Urspergensis* saith, *That by plenary Indulgences more Wickedness was brought into the World, and that they said, Let me act what Wickedness I will, I shall by these be deliver'd from Punishment:* So *Polidore Virgil* saith, *That after Indulgences were grown common, many did less abstain from Evil Actions.* So the *Centum Gravamina*, n. 3. An. 1523.

Ursperg.
Chron. p. 307.
Platina in
Bonif. 9.

And still the case grew worse, and the Scandal increased, as there were exposed to Sale; and those that had no mind to perform the Penance, or observe other Conditions, might buy it off with Money: By which means, though *Rome* grew rich, yet the Ecclesiastical Authority was brought into contempt, and encouragement was given to many Sins; as their own Historians do observe. And this (as it's well known) gave the occasion to the Reformation in *Germany*, when *Leo* the Xth prostituted the Indulgences to all Comers, and his Bankers promised pardon without any distinction of time, place or sin, as an Historian observes. See more of this in the Appendix.

Affert. 23.

Auricular Confession is the means whereby the Clergy work their Plots and Projects; 'tis a matter of meer Interest; and were there no gain in it, their chief Champions would be ashamed of it. The words of the Preacher are, Auricular Confession their great Intelligencer, the main curb of the Laity, whereby the Clergy hold them in awe, in being admitted

admitted to all the Secrets of States and Families, thereby to work their Purposes, their Plots, &c.

Now by this we are led to discover,

1. What Confession is, and how fit a means such a sort of Confession is to let them into the knowledg of Secrets.

2. What use has been made of it in their Church.

1. Confession in the Church of *Rome* requires “ be-
“ fore-hand a diligent Premeditation, and Examination
“ of the Conscience about all and singular Mortal Sins,
“ even the most secret, whether Acts, Thoughts, or De-
“ fires, with all their Aggravations, and Circumstances,
“ so far as may change the nature of the Sin, and then
“ to discover all those that they can call to mind, to the
“ Priest, from whom they expect Absolution. This Con-
“ fession they say is necessary to all after Baptism *jure*
“ *Divino* ; and if any Person knowingly retain any of
“ these from the knowledg of his Confessor, he can have
“ no benefit of the Absolution.

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 14. c. 5.
Can. 6, 7.

By this means, I hope, the first part of the Preacher's Charge is sufficiently evident. For if the most secret thoughts of that kind are to be laid open before the Confessor, and none of the Mortal Sins, nor their circumstances that affect the kind and nature of them, are to be omitted, certainly the Fathers must be let thereby into, if not all, yet the greatest *Secrets of States and Families, and hold them in awe* ; for if at any time their Penitents do step aside, and give them any provocation, or else refuse to act according to their Injunction, they are at their mercy whether they shall prosper, or be ruined in this World ; or whether they shall stand absolved or condemned as to another. So that if the Confessors have a mind to *work their Purposes, their Plots and Projects*, there cannot be a more useful Expedient than this. For what
may

may not they do who have the Consciences, the Reputation, the Safety here, and Salvation of men hereafter in their power? And if any thing under Heaven will support the *Romish* Church, this will. So that it is of the greatest consequence to maintain it, and to stamp a *Jus Divinum* upon it, to make it a Sacrament, and denounce an *Anathema* against them that shall call it into question. Therefore the Preacher thought he had reason to say, *should that go down, then farewell Popery.*

2. The next thing is to enquire into the matter of Fact, and to see whether what lies so fair for such an end has not been applied to it, and made to serve it. And of this among many I shall only give an Instance or two. The Story of the Holy League in *France* is well known to the World, and though not made more truly known, is made more famous, by the History of it not long since published by *Lewis Maimbourg*. In that League we are told by a much better and more faithful Historian, the great *Thuanus*, That the Confessors in private Confessions did calumniate the King; and did not only maintain it lawful for Subjects to enter into Leagues against his Consent, but that they sometimes refus'd to absolve their Penitents without they would join in the Design then on foot against *Henry* the III^d. The same use was made of this Divine Institution (as they would have it) by Father *Arnold*, Confessor to *Lewis* the XIIIth of *France*, who made the King to swear solemnly at Confession never to intermeddle with Affairs of State, nor to controul or dislike the Measures and Proceedings of the then powerful Favourite and great Minister of State, *Luines*. Now the Question is, whether our Author himself be not *ashamed* of such practices; and if he be, and the whole Church has the same reason for it, what then is the Reason, for which it was tied so strictly upon the

Con-

Hist. 1. 85.
Leydæ 1646.
p. 100.

Memoires de
Dux de Rohan.
lib. 1.

Consciences of men thus to confess, and all must be damn'd (as far as the Church can damn them) that put not themselves into the power of their Confessors.

They are bound to vow Ignorance under the severest Penalties. The words of the R. R. Preacher are—*Ignorance the Mother of their Devotion, which they are bound to by Vow, and under the severest Penalties; so that it is a Mortal Sin, so much as to doubt of any part of their Religion.* Assert. 24.

That Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion, is one of their known Maxims; and this without doubt was one reason why some of the most Devout among them, such as St. *Benedict*, St. *Francis*, and *Ignatius Loyola*, were also some of the most Ignorant: And if the Observation be true, there is the same reason for encouraging Ignorance in the Vulgar, and obliging others to it in many cases, as there is for encouraging Devotion, which is, it seems, the Daughter of it. From hence I conceive it was, that St. *Benedict*, in the Rules given to those of his Order, obliges them to such a course of Devotion as will secure them against what he himself was a hater of, Humane Learning; and that herein they might be like to their Founder, of whom St. *Gregory* saith, he was *knowingly ignorant, and wisely unlearned*. So that he that Dial. lib. 2. vows to observe these Rules, vows to be ignorant; and if he be knowing and learned otherwise than he is devout, he must either break his Vow to obtain it, or must acquire it more by Inspiration than Industry, which the strictness of his Rule will not afford him sufficient leisure for. This they are bound to by Vow, as the Preacher saith; but that any among them are bound to vow Ignorance, as the Adviser makes the Preacher to say, that I know no more than the Preacher saith it. To be bound to it by Vow, is to say this Vow binds to it; but to be

bound to vow, is to to be bound before the Vow. To this the next Assertion is a-kin.

Their avowed Principles are to keep the People in ignorance. For proof of this, let us review what is charged upon them by these Preachers. As,

1. *That Ignorance is with them the Mother of Devotion.* So we are told, that *such as pray in Latin, though they understand not what they say, do pray with as great devotion, and oftentimes more than others that pray in a Tongue they understand:* and that *no understanding of words can be compared to it.* So that if they do keep the People in ignorance, they act but conformable to this Principle.

2. The Preacher saith (which the Adviser hath cautiously left out) *If you do but blindly believe as the Church believes, and blindly obey what is imposed upon you, you are good Catholicks.* And what is this, if true, but an encouragement to be ignorant? And that it's true, I have shew'd Assertion 14, and 15. And so Bellarmine tells us, that the People are to rest satisfied in the Judgment of their Superiors. And say the Rhemists, *He saith enough, and defendeth himself sufficiently, that answereth he is a Catholick man, and will live and die in that Faith, &c. and that his Church can give a reason of all things which they demand of him.*

3. The Preacher saith, *It is a Mortal Sin so much as to doubt of any part of their Religion.* Which is in other words what is said by Navar, &c. that *it's an Heresie (and sure that's a Mortal Sin) to dispute a point of Faith,* and he incurs the suspicion of it that doth but question it. And to secure from doubting, an Heretick (as they call him) when reclaim'd to their Church, is to swear with an Imprecation to continue in it; with which Doubting is not very well consistent.

4. They

4. They take away *the Key of Knowledge*, the Holy Scriptures, and forbid the People to have or read them *under the greatest Penalties*. And the time has been, that those Parents have been brought to the Stake, that taught their Children so much as the Lord's Prayer, the ten Commandments, and the Apostles Creed, in the Vulgar Tongue.

Burn. Hist. of the Reformat. par. i. l. i. p. 31.

Now if all this be not *to keep the People in Ignorance*, nothing is: And if it be not their *avowed Principle* to keep them so, it's not easy to know what is.

They teach their People better Manners, than to rely upon the all-sufficient Merits of Christ. The Preacher here supposes, that since the Merits of Christ are All-sufficient, there is no need of the Merits of others; and that we cannot rely on our own Merits, or the Merits of others, without derogating from the All-sufficient Merits of Christ. For the better understanding of the Case, and Vindication of the Preacher in this matter,

Proposit. 26.

1. I shall observe, That the Church of *Rome* teaches, that we both can and do merit by Good Works. Thus the Council of *Trent* maintains, That *the Good Works of justified Persons are not so the gifts of God, but that they are also the Merits of the justified, and do truly Merit an increase of Grace here, and Glory hereafter.* And that as *Bellarmin* saith, *Because of the Work it self, altho there were no Covenant or Promise from God.* And as *Vasquez* adds, without the merits of Christ. For thus he states the Point, *There is no increase of value accrues to the Works of just Men by the Merits or Person of Christ, which they would not have had otherwise freely confer'd upon them from the same Grace by God alone, without Christ.* And he afterwards infers, That supposing the Merits of Christ to have obtained Grace for us to work, *We have no more*

Sess. 6. Can. 32.

De Justif. l. 5. c. 17, &c.

In 1a, 2da, q. 114. d. 214. c. 7.

Art. 8. d. 222. c. 3. n. 30, 31.

need of Christ's Merits to supply our defects, but that our own Good Works are of themselves sufficient. Now, if they thus teach that Good Works do truly merit, and that tho there were no Promise of God, and *without Christ*; I leave it to every one to judg whether they do not teach the People to rely on somewhat else than the Merits of Christ.

2. They teach the People to rely on the Merits of others.
As.

1. In their Doctrines of Supererogation and Indulgences; the former of which, is the Overplus of the Satisfaction of the Saints, as well as of Christ, deposited in the common Stock or Treasury of the Church. The later is the dispensing, issuing out, and applying that Stock, as the great Conservator of it, the Pope, sees meet; and by Virtue of which the defect of Merit in others is by that means compensated.

2. They teach the People also, to rely on the Merits of others in their Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints and Angels, whereby they constitute other Mediators than the alone Mediator Jesus Christ; whom they are taught to *fly to for Aid*, and whose Merits they depend upon for success in the things they are Solicitors for.

3. They are taught this farther, when they are taught to join the Merits of the Saints, with those of Christ in their Offices; and however they sometimes conclude in the Name of Christ, yet in the Body of the Collects the Merits of the Saints are made the ground of their Hope, as, *Grant that we may be helped or delivered by the Merits of blessed Saturnus, or Andrew, or Nicholas, &c.* If I should tax their Forms of Invocation to the Virgin Mary, I might compose a Treatise of it, where they are taught to recommend all their Hope and Comfort to her, and to desire that through her Merits and Intercession all may be directed, &c.

So

Proprium Missarum de Sanctis, &c.

Offic. parv.
B. M.

So that if to direct them to the Merits of others, to rely on them, to make them the ground of their hopes, to plead what they have done as an argument for their own success, and to pray to them as those that have merited to be heard for others, be to teach their people to rely on somewhat else than the Merits of Christ, then the Preacher was not out in ascribing this Doctrine to them.

But yet at last the way of wording it, may seem liable to exception, *viz. They teach the people better manners than to rely, &c.* But in this the Preacher is not so much to be blamed, since he herein manifestly alludes to the Argument they use for the Intercession of Saints and Angels, and their Invocation of them, which I shall chuse to deliver in the words of one of their own Authors: *After the Pater Noster, it is to be observed that the usual custom of the Catholick Church is to second it with an Ave Mary, whereby we do imitate the best manner of soliciting with a temporal Prince, to whom having humbly delivered our Petition, for more assurance of better success, we make also recourse to some powerful Favourite, &c.* Now if Christs Merits be all-sufficient, and what we are taught solely to rely upon, then their Courtly Argument of other Favourites and Intercessors and Merits, however mannerly it may be in conceit, is an affront to the Merits of our Saviour; and so much the more as a sufficiency in any respect is given to theirs, is there a derogation from the All-sufficiency of His.

The Clergy must live a single Life, whether honestly or no, it makes no matter. Affect. 27.

The reason why they must live singly, is for fear lest having Wives and Children, they should give the State security of their Obedience to their Sovereign. Affect. 28.

In these two Assertions of the Preacher, there are these Three Things contained,

I. That

Poor man's
Devotion
Par. 167.
p. 477.

1. That the Clergy in the Church of *Rome*, must and are obliged by the order of the Church, and their own Vow, to lead a single life.

2. That there is more care taken that they live *singly*, than that they live *honestly*.

3. That there are Political Reasons for this Imposition, of which the *giving the State security* is one.

1. The first is determined by the First and Second Councils of *Lateran*, &c. and is out of dispute.

2. That there is more care taken that the Clergy live single, than that they live honestly; I think is undeniable, if we may judge of it by the Punishments, the Allowances, and Resolutions of the Case.

As to the Punishments, if a Clergy-man be found to be married, he must either be separated from his Wife, or be deprived: So it has been decreed, and so it was executed in the Reign of *Queen Mary*; but if one in Orders keeps a Concubine, the Pope's *Taxa* fines him but 7 *Grosses*, or about 10 s.

As to the Allowances, one is absolutely forbidden, without any relaxation or Dispensation, the other has been openly allowed and licensed upon a Yearly Pension, as *Espencæus* complains.

And if we come to compare case with case, it's resolved, that the one is a sin greater than the other; so *Costerus* the Jesuit; *If a Priest commits Fornication, or keeps a Concubine at home, altho he is guilty of a grievous Sacriledg, yet he sins more grievously if he marries.*

3. That there are Political Reasons for this Imposition, and continuing it. It's granted by many learned men of that Church (such as *Cardinal Cajetan* and *Antoninus*, &c.) That the Marriage of Priests is not forbidden by any Divine, but by the Ecclesiastical Law, and so may be, and has been in several Cases dispensed with by the Pope.

Thuanus
Tom. 1. An.
1553.
Tax. Camer.
Apost.

In Tit. c. 1.
Digres. 1.

Enchir de.
Cœlib. c. 15.

It has been observed and lamented by several pious Persons among them, that the Celibacy of Priests has produced grievous Enormities, and that however useful it might have been in some season, yet now being turned to the contrary, that the Church ought to do as a good Physitian, that when he finds his Medicines rather hinder than promote the Cure, lays them aside. So the Prudent *Cassander*, and Pope *Pius* the IIId.

Consult.
Art. 23.
Platina.

Now when this is the Case, and the Church suffers so much by the Scandal, and the Souls of many by the indispensable obligation to Celibacy, why it should not be in these circumstances relaxed, I know not of any other reasons imaginable, than what are Political.

It's given as one reason by *Gerson* and *Bonaventure*, why Marriage was not forbidden to the Clergy in the Primitive Church, because it did not then abound in wealth and possessions as now: And we may hereby guess for what reason it is now forbidden, and that is, that the Treasure acquir'd by the Church may not be diverted, and that all within it having no other Relations than the Church, their care and endeavour may be directed thither, and their whole dependance may be upon it. Wife and Children are Hostages where ever they are, and the best Security a Prince can have from his Subjects; and whatever reasons they would find to break with him, these are the most likely means to retain them in their obedience; and therefore if the Prince has these in possession, it will be hard for the Church whatever use she has for its Clergy, to prevail with them to venture the loss of these pledges to serve it. So that a Church that steers it self by Political Maxims, and hath frequent Controversies with Crowned Heads, may see there is reason, if it would preserve the Clergy intire to it self, to prevent their Engagements in such a state of life, as would rob the Mitre
of

of so choice a Jewel, and translate it to, and settle it upon the Diadem of the Prince.

P. 55.

Thus have I gone through these 28 Observations the Adviser has drawn from the Sermons he quotes ; and now I will venture to leave it to the Reader's candor to judge concerning the truth of his Assertion in the close of them, *viz. 'Tis certain the Papists disown these Doctrines, and preach against them as much as these very Doctors, who appear so zealous to condemn them.*

ibid.

If our Author pleases, for the Vindication of his own Preachers, to shew us where they have been as zealous against these Doctrines, in their Pulpits, as those he quotes and reviles have deservedly been ; and to quote as good Authorities to clear their Church from these charges and imputations, as I have quoted to maintain them, he will do much better service than by a risque of Rhetorical Exclamations, try to amuse rather than satisfy his Reader. He has told us, *that the most that can be said of these 28 Points is, that some of them are mistakes of the Preachers, others Exaggerations, others Inferences from some single Author ; others absolute Falsities, and wicked calumnies.* Now this would have been a work becoming himself to undertake, and with a gentle hand (for he must not press too hard) to have ranged these Points in their order, and to have told us which he would be pleased to leave to these Preachers, and which they will take to themselves. For if he leaves it to the Preachers ; they will turn the Points upon his Church, and the *wicked Calumnies* upon himself. The world on this side the Four Seas is grown too wise to be any longer entertained with such Ecclesiastical Amusements ; it's Reason and Authority, close Arguing, and a clear stating of Matters, that is expected And however *Misrepresentations* at one time, and *Agreements* at another, and *Cauti-*

ons and *Advices* at a third, may have their turn, and be of use in defect of better; yet they will be like *Gondomar's Lye*, that may at some time do a piece of hopeful service, but is not to be too often try'd, lest it become unsuccessful and ridiculous. Our Author cannot but know that this is a way they may soon be made weary of, if the Preachers should turn Writers, and could apply their time to no better purpose; since no Church in the world lies more open than his own. The cause would not then be like a taking up an occasional Sermon, or a single Author, and trying tricks upon it, sometimes mangling, sometimes omitting, sometimes changing, sometimes extorting that from it which was never in it. And when all is done, *the most that can be said is, that some of them are mistakes of the Misrepresenter's and Advisers; others Exaggerations; others Inferences from some single Author, or some Abuse in Practice; others Absolute Falsities, and Wicked Calumnies.* But they would appear with a Mass of Irrefragable Authorities, such as Popes and Councils; and the *Veterane Army* of obsolete *Missals*, and *Breviaries*, *Offices* and *Legends*, which thow they would have buried in oblivion, and the Writers of the Church of *England* have been so charitable of late to them, as but sparingly to produce; yet it is an Advantage against what pretends to be an Infallible Church, and the present Writers of it amongst us, that there needs not a greater. And if they had a mind to proceed, and would make Collections of Doctrines and Principles from such Books as have come forth with uncontrouled *Imprimaturs*, there will be no end of this Labour. But thanks be to God they have better things before them, and care not to squander away their time in such Inquiries, which can be of little better use than old Romances, to shew the Ignorance and Superstition of the Times in which these

things were received with the Veneration of Gospel, and the Degeneracy of that Church that brought them into the World.

It's a mean thing for a man of Wit (as our Author is) to play away his time in such little Undertakings. He seems to be made for better things, and it would be a matter worthy of himself to try his Talent in some of the abovesaid Points, and at once to clear their Church of the Obloquy of those Doctrines, or the Doctrines from the Error charged upon them. As for example, let him employ some of his spare Minutes about reconciling Transubstantiation to Sense and Reason, or in shewing the admirable Advantage and Edification that there is in having the Service and Scripture in an Unknown Tongue; or proving the invariable Conformity of their Church, to Scripture, Antiquity, and it self, in their Infallibility, Confession, Indulgences, Images, Pilgrimages, &c. For it will be a very hard thing to believe a Church Infallible, that has mistaken, and has neither Scripture, nor Antiquity, nor it self to plead for it self. That has Missals and Breviaries, and Legends and Authentick Scriptures in one Age, that they are ashamed of in another, and for the vindication of which, are fain at last to come from the pinnacle of Infallibility, to the humility of an *Exposition*.

Pag. 50.

He may complain till Doomsday *that our Guides have gone out of the way*, and may fill the World with *Advices and Cautions* against the *Poison infused into Congregations from the High Places*; but it will be to little purpose, unless he proves it as well as says it, and gives a better Testimony of his Ability and Sincerity than what has appeared in this Collection.

As to his Ability (whatever it may be in a better Cause) after all the rally against the Preachers, he ha

not so much as ventured upon one Point, but has acted all along as a meer Supposer. As to his Sincerity, if the leaving out Quotations, and often whole Paragraphs and Clauses tending to the explication and confirmation of what was taught by the Preachers ; if mangling and altering the Words and Sense be Certificates of it, he is one of the most candid and ingenuous Writers of this Age. I shall not trouble the Reader with a Collection of this kind, I have here and there given a taste as I went along, chusing rather to expose the Argument than the Writer ; and that being done, to hasten to an end.

The Two remaining Cautions refer either to the descriptions given in some Sermons of what is held and practiced in the Church of Rome, as *Pilgrimages, Hair-Shirts, &c. the Mass and Purgatory*, or else to the season of Preaching them. In both of which it had become our Author first to disclaim the Charge, or disprove the thing, before he had blamed the Preachers. For if the *Pilgrimages, going bare-foot, Hair-Shirts, and Whips* used in the Church of Rome are as far from being means of going to Heaven, as the Preacher supposeth, he said not amiss, *That they may as well expect to bring a Cart, as a Soul to Heaven by such means*: And if these are taught to be means when they are not, they deserve to be treated with some Contempt and Severity. Doubtless, in no place is a strict observation of the Rules of Decency and good Order more requisite than in the Pulpit ; but to call some things what they are, will be contrary to both and intolerable in the opinion of those that would have them to be that which they are not ; and who are more willing and forward to find out the faults of others, than to espy, acknowledge, or vindicate their own. The matter lay fair before our Author, and it would have been a generous Undertaking to have fastned upon the Argument,

ment, and then he might in the Close, with honour and advantage have exposed the *Contemptuous* humour that he pretends to discover in those Preachers.

He may be pleased to remember *A Vindication of a Passage in Dr. Sherlock's Sermon, Preached before the House of Commons*, that yet wants an Answer after almost Three Years expectation of it; and methinks those that take an occasion so often of late to put us in mind of the Former, should as well consider that we have not forgotten the Latter; and if the *Adviser* had to his *Invective* against the Sermon, tack'd a substantial Reply to the *Vindication* of it, he would have done greater service to his Church, and given greater satisfaction to others, than by exclaiming against the unseasonableness of it. When could there have been a fitter opportunity for their own Vindication from the Doctrines of Deposition, &c. than when they had this Provocation given them, before that Honourable Assembly? When could it have been more seasonable for them to have appeared in it, however unseasonable they thought it in him to preach it? If this had then been done, they had gone far toward the opening the Eyes of that solemn Assembly that desired the Dr. to print it, and the stopping the mouths of such petulant Preachers; but when they have let the Cause drop, as if they were willing to have it forgotten; when there has been so long a silence, till they come forth with their late *Exaggerations*, they give us too great reason to believe, That all this proceeds from the weakness of a sort of people, that when they find themselves not able to encounter an Adversary, pelt him with Reproaches.

P Age 3. l. 6. after *rest*, r. *except the two last*. p. 8. l. 1. r. *Preachers*. p. 14. Marg. l. 4. r. *Disquis.* p. 19. mar. del. lin. ult. p. 22. mar. l. 1. r. *Pelag.* p. 25. mar. l. 8. r. *Pelag.* p. 25. l. 4. r. *in Consultation*, mar. l. 19. r. l. 3. p. 26. l. 26. r. *Heretics*. p. 28. l. 3. r. *into it*, mar. l. 1. r. *In 1. Tim.* p. 30. mar. l. 5. r. *Sacred.* p. 37. mar. l. 4. r. *Seff.* p. 43. mar. l. 2. r. *Desparæ.* p. 46. mar. l. 1. r. 86. l. 5. r. *Duc.*

SIGN BOOK CARD

**AND LEAVE AT
CHARGING DESK
IF BOOK IS TO BE USED
OUT OF THE
LIBRARY BUILDING**

3.W7

pulpits

.41129

